

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
LUFKIN DIVISION**

LATRENNIA PLEASANT, §  
§  
Plaintiff, § CIVIL ACTION NO. 9:15-CV-00166-MHS  
§  
v. §  
§  
JOHN A. SINZ, §  
§  
Defendant. §  
§

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

This case was assigned to the Honorable Zack Hawthorn, United States Magistrate Judge, for all pretrial matters pursuant to General Order 05-07. On December 4, 2015, the Plaintiff, Latrenia Pleasant, proceeding *pro se*, filed a complaint against the Defendant, Judge Sinz, under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1985 for alleged violations of her constitutional rights. (Doc. No. 1). Included within Pleasant's complaint were claims against Judge Sinz in both his individual and official capacities. The magistrate judge filed a report and recommendation that the court dismiss Pleasant's claims for damages against Judge Sinz as barred by judicial immunity. (Doc. No. 31). Further, the magistrate judge recommended that Pleasant's claims for injunctive and declaratory relief against Judge Sinz in his individual capacity should be dismissed *sua sponte* for failure to state a claim for which relief can be granted. *Id.* Finally, the magistrate judge recommended that Pleasant's claims against Judge Sinz in his official capacity be dismissed *sua sponte* and without prejudice. *Id.* No objections have been filed to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation, and the time for so doing has passed. After conducting a *de novo* review

of the magistrate judge's report and recommendation, the court finds that the magistrate judge's findings and conclusions are correct. See FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3).

One outstanding motion by Pleasant, however, must still be resolved. On July 18, 2016, Pleasant filed a motion seeking to add eight separate individuals as plaintiffs to her complaint. (Doc. No. 29). Pursuant to the Scheduling and Discovery Order for this case, the deadline to add additional parties was July 13, 2016. (Doc. No. 27). Where a pleading is entered after a deadline set in a Scheduling and Discovery Order, such schedule "may be modified only for good cause and with the judge's consent." FED. R. CIV. P. 16(b)(4). Pleasant's motion fails to articulate any reason for why the court should permit leave to add the additional parties as plaintiffs to her complaint. As such, Pleasant's "Motion for Adding Parties" is **DENIED**.

It is, therefore, **ORDERED** that the magistrate judge's report and recommendation is **ADOPTED**; and this case is **DISMISSED**. A final judgment will be entered separately.

**SIGNED** this 1st day of September, 2016.



---

MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE